

Remarks

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed June 1, 2006. An appropriate Petition for Extension of Time to Respond is submitted herewith, together with the appropriate fee.

Claims 1-45 were pending in the Application prior to the outstanding Office Action. In the Office Action, the Examiner allowed claims 21-29, rejected claims 1-4, 8-13, 17-20, 37-39, 42-45, and objected to claims 5-7, 14-16, 34-36, 40 and 41. The present Response cancels claims 1-4, 8-13, 17-20, 30-33, 37-39, and 42-45, and amends claims 5, 14, 34, and 40, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration claims 5-7, 14-16, 21-29, 34-36, 40 and 41.

I. Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 3, 4, 9-11, 13, 18-20, 30, 32-33, 38, 39, and 42-45 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Young et al (6,190,414). In the interest of furthering prosecution, Applicants request cancellation of claims 1, 3, 4, 9-11, 13, 18-20, 30, 32-33, 38, 39, and 42-45.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 3, 4, 11, 13, 30, 32-33, 39, and 43 are rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Jackson (6,454,807). In the interest of furthering prosecution, Applicants request cancellation of claims 1, 3, 4, 11, 13, 30, 32-33, 39, and 43.

II. Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 2, 8, 12, 17, 31, and 37 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Young et al. (6,190,414). In the interest of furthering prosecution, Applicants request cancellation of claims 2, 8, 12, 17, 31, and 37

III. Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants appreciate the indication that claims 21-29 are allowable over the prior art.

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to claims 5-7, 14-16, 34-36, 40, and 41 solely as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants have amended claims 5, 14, 34 and 40 to include the limitations of the base claim. Applicants submit that claims 6, 7 (which depend from claim 5), 15, 16 (which depend from claim 14), 35, 36 (which depend from claim 34) and 41 (which depends from claim 40) are no longer dependent upon a rejected base claim. Applicants therefore request that the objection be removed.

IV. CONCLUSION

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and a Notice of Allowance is requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 10/2/06

By: MLR
Michael L. Robbins
Reg. No. 54,774

Customer No. 23910
FLIESLER MEYER LLP
Four Embarcadero Center, Fourth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-4156
Telephone: (415) 362-3800

- 7 -

Attorney Docket No.: SFMT-01056USD
MRobbins/SFMT/1056USD/1056USD.Resp.OA.